

In re: Aleksander Szlam
Filed: January 29, 2002
Serial No.: 10/059,872
Page 14

In the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 6A. This sheet, which includes Fig. 6A replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6A. In Fig. 6A, previously stated "2. SEND DEVICE INFORMATION FROM CONTROLLER" was amended to "2. SEND DEVICE INFORMATION TO CONTROLLER"

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

This is a complete response to the outstanding Office Action mailed November 15, 2005. Claims 1, 9, 20, and 25 have been amended and claim 22 has been canceled herein. No new matter has been added to the currently pending claims. Support for amended claims 1, 9, 20, and 25 can be found in, for example, original claims 22 and 23 and figure 1. Upon entry of this response, claims 1-21 and 23-26 remain pending in the present application. The Applicant traverses all of the rejections of the Office Action. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the above-identified patent application and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Response to Drawing Objections

Applicant corrected FIG. 6A as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review and respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

II. Response to Specification Objections

Applicant corrected paragraphs 44 and 46 as suggested by the

Examiner. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review and respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

III. Response to Claims 1, 20, and 25 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1, 20, and 25 have been preliminarily rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Specifically claims 1, 20, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent 5,889,845 to Staples et al. (hereinafter, "Staples").

Applicant has amended claims 1, 20, and 25 to include allowable elements of other previously allowed claims acknowledged by the Examiner. The amendments submitted herein put claims 1, 20, and 25 in condition for allowance. Therefore the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

The Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 2-5, 21, 23-24, and 26 depend on independent claims 1, 20, and 25 respectively, claims 2-5, 21, 23-24, and 26 contain all limitations of independent claims 1, 20, and 25, respectively. Since independent claims 1, 20, and 25 should be allowed, as argued herein, pending dependent claims 22-5, 21, 23-24, and 26 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. In

re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1608 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

IV. Response to Claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 have been preliminarily rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Specifically claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent 5,889,845 to Staples et al. (hereinafter, "Staples").

The Applicant respectfully submits the claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 recite the limitation of accepting an incoming communication on a communications link from the second location and the incoming communication being to a telephone number for the user at the second location. The office action ignores antecedent basis when interpreting the claims or incorrectly construed the reference. The office action cites to Figures 16 and 19, as disclosing a telephone call from the second location and the telephone call being a telephone number at the second location.

This is an incorrect reading of the reference. The "second telephone number", referred to by Staple is the telephone number of the remote location or first location, as referred in the earlier embodiment disclosed in Staples. When read in view of

the entire disclosure, the cited portion discloses telephone call from the second location and the telephone call being a telephone number at the first location; opposite from what is disclosed and claimed by the Applicant in claims 6, 9, 15, and 18. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that for at least these reasons the 102 rejection be withdrawn and claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 be allowed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 7-8, 10-14, 16-17, and 19 depend on independent claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 respectively, claims 7-8, 10-14, 16-17, and 19 contain all limitations of independent claims 6, 9, 15, and 18, respectively.

Since independent claims 6, 9, 15, and 18 should be allowed, as argued herein, pending dependent claims 7-8, 10-14, 16-17, and 19 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1608 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments herein put the amended claims in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and

In re: Aleksander Szlam
Filed: January 29, 2002
Serial No.: 10/059,872
Page 19

rejections have been traversed, rendered moot and/or accommodated, and that presently pending claims 1-21 and 23-26 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and the presently pending claims are hereby courteously requested. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Aleksander Szlam

By 
Andrew R. Martin
Registration No. 45,413
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 2-15-06

